

## REMARKS

By this amendment, Claim 1 has been amended. Hence, Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. The amendments to the claims and the new claims do not add any new matter to this application. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed August 20, 2007 are addressed hereinafter.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9-11 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly anticipated by Kyon Holman (Dell OpenManage Network Manager, November 17, 20, hereinafter "Dell").

Applicant maintains the earlier position and arguments, which for brevity Applicant will not repeat herein, but will briefly summarize. The Dell reference is lacking several claimed elements, and is not sufficient to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102. The amendment to Claim 1 is to bring focus to a specific feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by Dell or any other of the prior art references asserted thus far, and is made in response to the telephone interview on October 17, 2007. At that time, Applicant and the Examiner discussed the claimed action mechanisms.

Specifically, the claimed step of “generating instructions and applying changes to the first configuration information” based on a user’s interaction with the claimed “action mechanism” cannot be performed by any portion of Dell, either the “<<” and “>>” buttons shown in Dell’s FIG. 10 or any other feature. As stated earlier, it is not possible for Dell’s “<<” and “>>” buttons to act as action mechanisms, nor can they enable a user to perform any actions affecting configuration information, as claimed. Instead, Dell describes these buttons only for jumping to previous and next highlighted differences between two configuration files. (Dell, page 18, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet-point).

For at least the above reasons, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) can now be withdrawn.

All remaining Claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as either explicitly reciting or depending from other claims which recite substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejections of all remaining Claims are also defective, and should also be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that such contact would be helpful in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

/christophermtanner#41518/

---

Christopher M. Tanner  
Reg. No. 41,518

Date: Nov 15, 2007  
2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, CA 95110-1089  
Voice: (408) 414-1238  
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076